

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/826,267	PLETZER ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Michael I Poe	1732

All Participants:

Status of Application: _____

(1) Michael I Poe (Examiner). (3) _____

(2) Todd Wight (Applicant's attorney). (4) _____

Date of Interview: 11 February 2004

Time: 5:00 pm

Type of Interview:

Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

the rejections presented in the Office action mailed on 11/05/2003

Claims discussed:

17, 30 and 34

Prior art documents discussed:

the prior art of record

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner called the applicant's attorney to discuss proposed amendments necessary to place the instant application in condition for allowance. Although the examiner acknowledged that the prior art is directed to altering the surface texture of a biocompatible layer rather than altering the surface structure of the biocompatible layer as disclosed in the applicant's original disclosure, the examiner stipulated that the limitation "altering a surface of the biocompatible material" in the instant claims was readable on altering the surface texture and/or structure of the biocompatible material layer. Therefore, the examiner stipulated that the processes of the prior art would be readable on the claims as currently amended by the amendment filed on January 29, 2004. As such, the examiner proposed amending the independent claims 17, 30 and 34 to further include forming a plurality of alterations between articulations of the stent during the altering step to better distinguish the applicant's invention over the prior art of record. The examiner further proposed changing the title and abstract as indicated in the Examiner's Amendment to make the title and abstract better reflect the allowed invention. The applicant's attorney approved the proposed changes and authorized the examiner to proceed with the changes via Examiner's Amendment.